RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 1 2 2007

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated January 3, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-22 are pending, the independent claims being claims 1, 10 and 18. Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Claims 10-13 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Sezan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,236,395. Claim 10 recites the limitation of "adjusting a display rate of the keyframes designated in step (a) according to a fast forward/rewind speed of the video source so that the keyframes are displayed for a predetermined time during fast forward/rewind of the video source."

Sezan fails to show, teach or imply the limitations of: "adjusting a display rate of the keyframes designated in step (a) according to a fast forward/rewind speed of the video source so that the keyframes are displayed for a predetermined time during fast forward/rewind of the video source," as recited in independent claim 10. Independent claims 1 and 18 recites similar limitations.

Sezan's invention teaches providing at least one description scheme. For audio and/or video programs, a program description scheme provides information regarding the associated program; for the user, a user description scheme provides information regarding the user's preferences; and for the system, a system description scheme provides information regarding the system. The description schemes are independent of

one another. The system may use a combination of the description schemes to enhance its ability to search, filter, and browse audiovisual information, see col. 1, lines 55-67.

The Final Office Action on page 2 cites Fig. 7-8 and Col. 13 line 65 – Col. 14 line 40 to show these limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree. In this section Sezan teaches an audiovisual description scheme using thumbnail functions as a function of category that provides a display with a set of categories on the left hand side. Selecting *a particular category*, such as news, provides *a set of thumbnail views of different programs* that are currently available for viewing. The thumbnail views are short video segments that provide an indication of the content of the respective actual program that it corresponds with. Referring to FIG. 5, *a thumbnail view of available programs in terms of channels* may be displayed, if desired... Although, as noted in Fig. 7-8, "The frequency of the number of frames may be selected... view may likewise be displayed," and as shown in Fig. 7-8 the system can have a frequency of x1, x5, x10. However, this still does not show *adjusting a keyframe display rate* of the modified visual summary *to correspond with a fast forward/rewind speed of the video source* so that the keyframes can be displayed during fast forward/rewind of the video source, as claimed in claim 1, for example. Nothing in Sezan teaches that the frequency of keyframes is related to the speed of the video source. Sezan simply teaches that its thumbnail category scheme may be manipulated, e.g. frequency, but it is not based on the forward/rewind speed of the video source.

Accordingly, Sezan does not teach adjusting a display rate of the keyframes designated in step (a) according to a fast forward/rewind speed of the video source so that the keyframes are displayed for a predetermined time during fast forward/rewind of the

video source. Sezan only uses keyframes to categorize multiple video content for display, filtering, browsing *and manipulating* etc. and not within a signal video source for display rate adjustment. Sezan solves a different problem (e.g. browsing/searching of a video database or multiple video content from a content provider, see col. 21 line 7-44).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Sezan cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Sezan fails to disclose each and every element recited. Having shown that Sezan fails to disclose each and every element claimed, applicant submits that the reason for the Examiner's rejection of method claim 10 has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 10.

Claims 1-8, 18-22 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,728,473 by Chotoku et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,335,742 by Takemoto and Sezan. Claims 8-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chotoku, Takemoto and Sezan in view of EP 1085756 by Van Beek et al. Claims 14-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,941 by Dimitrova et al.

Independent claims 1 and 18 recite the limitation of "adjusting a keyframe display rate of the modified visual summary to correspond with a fast forward/rewind speed of the video source so that the keyframes can be displayed during fast forward/rewind of the video source," which has been shown to be not anticipated and allowable in view of the cited references. The addition of Chotoku, Takemoto, Van Beek and Dimitrova fail to

cure the infirmities of Sezan. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and 18 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10.

It is respectfully submitted that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met;

> 1. there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine the reference teachings;
>
> 2. there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and
>
> 3. the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)

Accordingly, since the combination of Chotoku, Takemoto and Sezan., fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claims as required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 12 are allowable.

With regard to claims 2-9, 11-17 and 19-22, these claims ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 10 and 18, which have been shown to be allowable in view of the cited references. Accordingly, claims 2-9, 11-17 and 19-22 are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 1 2 2007

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. Entry of this amendment and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079

Date: February 12, 2007

By: Thomas J. Onka
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,053

Mail all correspondence to:
Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615

Certificate of Mailing/Transmission Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313-1450 or transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No (571) 273-8300 on 2/12/07.

Thomas J. Onka
(Name of Registered Rep.)

(Signature and Date) 2/12/07